

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/681,219	SUH, JUNG-SOO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Haoshian Shih	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-8 are pending in this application and have been examined in response to application filed on 05/14/2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Greer et al. (Greer, US 6,993,722 B1).**

3. As to **independent** claim 1, Greer discloses a method of controlling key input in a multifunctional product capable of receiving outside signals said multifunctional product having a key input unit (fig.6; "remote control"), a monitor, and a main unit (col.1, lines 15-24; col.7, lines 21-24) the method comprising the steps of:

(a) sensing commands input via the key input unit (col.4, lines 35-38; "remote control" issues commands to drive the multifunctional product);

(b) determining an output mode of the monitor (col.3, lines 51-58; output mode is determined to produce best displaying result); and

(c) processing an input command by the main unit according to the output mode of the monitor by communicating with the monitor after sensing the command input from the key input unit (col.4, lines 39-45; the key input unit (fig.6 "remote control") have the ability to map the input commands of the main unit that is actively being displayed).

Wherein the output mode of the monitor determines whether input commands from the key input unit will be one of canceled and executed (fig.1d, "32", fig.1e, "42", fig.1g, "62"; col.11, lines 65 – col.12, lines 15; col.7, lines 30-34; The input operation is halted, paused, stopped or disconnected from the pervious main device when the output mode is of the current main device)

4. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 2, Greer discloses a method of controlling key input in a multifunctional product capable of receiving outside signals said multifunctional product having a key input unit (fig.6; "remote control"), a monitor, and a main unit (col.1, lines 15-24; col.7, lines 21-24) the method comprising the steps of:

(a) sensing commands input via the key input unit (col.4, lines 35-38; "remote control" issues commands to drive the multifunctional product);

(b) determining an output mode of the monitor (col.3, lines 51-58; output mode is determined to produce best displaying result); and

(c) processing an input command by the main unit according to the output mode of the monitor by communicating with the monitor after sensing the command input

from the key input unit (col.4, lines 39-45; the key input unit (fig.6 "remote control") have the ability to map the input commands of the main unit that is actively being displayed).

Wherein the step (c) comprises, if the output mode of the monitor is not a PC mode, canceling input command from the key input unit. (fig.2b and fig 6 both illustrated controls for mode switching; col.7, lines 30-34; The input operation is halted, paused, stopped or disconnected from the pervious main device when the output mode is of the current main device).

5. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 3, Greer discloses Greer discloses a method of controlling key input in a multifunctional product capable of receiving outside signals said multifunctional product having a key input unit (fig.6; "remote control"), a monitor, and a main unit (col.1, lines 15-24; col.7, lines 21-24) the method comprising the steps of:

(a) sensing commands input via the key input unit (col.4, lines 35-38; "remote control" issues commands to drive the multifunctional product);

(b) determining an output mode of the monitor (col.3, lines 51-58; output mode is determined to produce best displaying result); and

(c) processing an input command by the main unit according to the output mode of the monitor by communicating with the monitor after sensing the command input from the key input unit (col.4, lines 39-45; the key input unit (fig.6 "remote control") have the ability to map the input commands of the main unit that is actively being displayed).

Art Unit: 2173

Wherein the step (c) comprises, if the output mode of the monitor is a PC mode, properly executing input command from the key input unit. (when the output mode is a PC mode (fig.1g, "60"), other modes (fig.1g "62") are suspended, and the input commands from the PC are properly executed (fig.1g, "63")).

6. As to claim 4, Greer discloses displaying a current mode indicator according to the output mode of the monitor, in the monitor (col.10, lines 9-10).

7. As to claim 5, Greer discloses displaying current mode indicator according to the output mode of the monitor, in the monitor (col.10, lines 9-10).

8. As to claim 6, Greer discloses communication between the monitor and the main unit is performed by at least one of serial and parallel communication (col.10, lines 46; "universal serial bus for communicating").

9. As to claim 8, Greer discloses the multifunctional product is one of a computer and a TV signal receiving apparatus (fig.2b, "TV", "PC"; col.5, lines 44-46).

Art Unit: 2173

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greer in view of Lambrecht et al. (Lambrecht, US 5,754,801).

12. As to claim 7, Greer does not the serial communication between the monitor and the computer main unit (fig.2a, "BUS 95"; lines 44-53). Greer does not specifically disclose the communication is performed by an I2C bus/protocol system.

In the same field of endeavor, Lambrecht discloses a serial communication performed by an I2C bus (col.13, lines 34-36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Greer and Lambrecht before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the communication bus taught by Greer to include an I2C bus taught by Lambrecht with the motivation being to provide more communication interface options for the user.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 05/14/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

14. Applicant argues " With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that Greer does not disclose or suggest at least, "wherein the output mode of the monitor determines whether input commands from the key input unit will be one of canceled and executed." Greer only discloses that an application can be terminated once there has been a determination of a resource conflict between two different applications. Further, col. 7, lines 30-34, only discusses that if a game or DVD operation is underway, the associated movie or game may be recognized as being active and may be paused and minimized on the interface display, causing operations to halt. This operation is performed when a television mode is activated by a user. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of the output mode of the monitor determining whether input commands from the key_ input unit will be canceled or executed. This specific feature is not set forth in Greer, therefore Greer does not anticipate claim 1."

In response to the applicant's arguments, Greer discloses at col.12, lines 26-50, a context manager that mimics a Microsoft® windows environment for foreground and background applications, the application that is currently displayed (output mode) determines if the input matches the currently displayed application, and execute key input commands if there is a match. The selection of different applications (output modes) is done via a menu key.

15. Applicant argues " With respect to claim 2, Applicant amends this claim to place it independent form and submits that Greer does not disclose or suggest at least, "wherein the step (c) comprises, if the output mode of the monitor is not a PC mode, canceling input commands from the key input unit," as recited in amended claim 2. The Examiner cites, inter alia, col. 11, line 65 -col. 12, line 15 and col. 7, lines 30-34 as allegedly satisfying the features of claim 2. The teachings of Greer are set forth in the paragraph above. There is no teaching or suggestion of determining whether an output mode of the monitor is not a PC mode, and then canceling input commands from a key. input unit. This specific feature is not set forth in Greer, therefore Greer does not anticipate claim 2."

In response to the applicant's arguments, Greer discloses at col.12, lines 26-50, a context manager that mimics a Microsoft® windows environment for foreground and background applications, the application that is currently displayed (output mode) determines if the key input matches the currently displayed application, execute key input commands if there is a match. The selection of different applications (output modes) is done via a menu key. Further, fig.2B and fig.6 illustrates mode for selecting a PC mode (user presses the menu key to select "PC mode") and deselecting a PC mode (user presses another menu key to select a different mode).

16. Applicant argues " Applicant submits that claim 3 is patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 2."

In response to the applicant's arguments, see examiner's response set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 2.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haoshian Shih whose telephone number is (571) 270-1257. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 0730-1700.

Art Unit: 2173

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HSS


TADESSE HAILU
PRIMARY EXAMINER